RISK ESTIMATES FOR NONSMOKER LUNG CANCER BASED UPON MODELING PROCEDURES

- In 1985, Repace and Lowrey published an article claiming that exposure to ETS is responsible for 500 to 5,000 lung cancer deaths per year in the United States.[1] This report received extensive press coverage upon its release.

- The report contains two highly theoretical models for estimating risks of lung cancer from ETS exposure. One model relies upon a "reinterpretation" of the epidemiologic studies of lung cancer in nonsmokers; the second model estimates lung cancer mortality among nonsmokers based on a single study dealing with the Seventh Day Adventists, a religious group known for its vigorous opposition to smoking.

- Critics of the Repace and Lowrey approach have pointed out that the estimates are based on errors and "unrealistic assumptions" which result in overestimations of exposure.[2] One analysis of the model showed that, depending on the assumptions and input data used, the estimates are inherently inaccurate and may vary by as much as 300-fold.[3] Another scientist noted that the exposure and dose levels used in the modeling exercise were not based on actual measurements; such measurements reported elsewhere range from "ten- to one-hundred-fold less than that in the Repace and Lowrey model."[4]

2061690988

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xrck0000

- Other criticisms have focused on the report's methods of analysis,[5-7] and suggest that Repace and Lowrey failed to control for other confounding factors, and that their model did not provide "the very statistical bases of estimation procedures."[4]

- Repace and Lowrey's estimate of nonsmoker lung cancer risks in the workplace was also criticized by scientists who noted that none of the epidemiologic studies of ETS exposure and disease in nonsmoking working women report a statistically significant increase in risk.[2]

- Two British researchers, Darby and Pike, published a paper in 1988 describing another type of mathematical model which predicted potential effects from ETS exposure based on data from a study on active smoking.[8] Even when adjustments were made for childhood exposure to ETS, the authors reported that the model predicted a risk for nonsmokers that was smaller than "the underlying background risk for lung cancer." They concluded that their model could not explain the difference between risks reported for nonsmokers in epidemiologic studies and the low levels of ETS exposure reported in other studies.

2061690989

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xrck0000

- The Darby and Pike model was criticized in 1990 by Wald, et al., authors of one of the earlier meta-analyses on the epidemiologic studies of ETS exposure and lung cancer incidence.[9] Wald's group questioned Darby and Pike's conclusion that there was a discrepancy between risks estimated by epidemiologic studies and by exposure data. Darby and Pike replied that the existing cotinine data employed by Wald, et al., were possibly both insufficient and inappropriate to allow an adequate comparison to be made with the epidemiologic data.[10]

2061690990

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xrck0000

REFERENCES

1. Repace, J.L. and Lowrey, A.H., "A Quantitative Estimate of Nonsmokers' Lung Cancer Risk from Passive Smoking," Environment International 11(1): 3-22, 1985.

2. Arundel, A., Irwin, T. and Sterling, T., "Nonsmoker Lung Cancer Risks from Tobacco Smoke Exposure: An Evaluation of Repace and Lowrey's Phenomenological Model," Journal of Environmental Science and Health C4(1): 93-118, 1986.

3. Arundel, A., Sterling, T. and Weinkam, J., "Never Smoker Lung Cancer Risks from Exposure to Particulate Tobacco Smoke," Environment International 13: 409-426, 1987.

4. Lebowitz, M.D., "The Potential Association of Lung Cancer with Passive Smoking," Environment International 12: 3-9, 1986.

5. Johnson, C. and Letzel, H., "Letter to the Editors," Environment International 12: 21-22, 1986.

6. Burch, P.R.J., "Health Risks of Passive Smoking: Problems of Interpretation," Environment International 12: 23-28, 1986.

7. Kilpatrick, S.J., "Letter to the Editors," Environment International 12: 29-31, 1986.

8. Darby, S.C. and Pike, M.C., "Lung Cancer and Passive Smoking: Predicted Effects from a Mathematical Model for Cigarette Smoking and Lung Cancer," British Journal of Cancer 58: 825-831, 1988.

9. Wald, N., Nanchahal, K., Cuckle, H. and Thompson, S., "Letter to the Editor: Lung Cancer and Passive Smoking," British Journal of Cancer 61: 337, 1990.

10. Darby, S.C. and Pike, M.C., "Response to the Letter from Dr. Wald," British Journal of Cancer 61: 337-338, 1990.

2061690991

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xrck0000